



UNIVERSITY OF
OREGON

Office of
Campus Planning

May 30, 2018

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Eleni Tsivitz, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the May 4, 2018 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks, Selena Blick, Greg Bryant, Jane Brubaker, Hilary Gerdes,
Michael Griffel, Michael Harwood, Ken Kato, Diana Libuda, Amy Salmore,
Cathy Soutar, Rob Thallon, Christine Thompson, Chuck Triplett

Staff: Eleni Tsivitz (Campus Planning)

Guests: Kevin Farthing, Jeff Madsen, Steve Mital, Aaron Olsen, Matt Roberts

CPC Agenda:

1. *Campus Plan* Oregon Model for Sustainable Development (OMSD) Amendment - Initial Discussion

Background: Staff introduced the purpose of this agenda item, described the current structure of the OMSD and reminded the committee about previous discussions related to this amendment. She also reviewed the specific proposed amendment text related to the criteria which are used to determine the projects that must achieve the Energy, Water, and People Goal and those which must achieve the LEED Gold Goal. Steve Mital (Director of Sustainability, CPFM) described the evolution of sustainable development plans in the university's history and showed the projects that have fallen under each of those plans. He described how the goals of the OMSD have been met since it was adopted in 2011, how regulations (including the Oregon Energy Code and LEED certification requirements) have changed, and how market conditions have changed since 2011. As a result of these changes, he described the proposed amendments to the OMSD as shown in the presentation.

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- There have been times during the course of a project where LEED certification feels like chasing points or percentages, so it is great to make changes that make the program thoroughly sustainable.

CAMPUS PLANNING AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

1276 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1276 <http://cpfm.uoregon.edu>

- Focus on designing high-performance envelopes and passive systems rather than trying to make mechanical systems more efficient.

In response to questions from committee members or guests, members of Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM) provided the following clarifications:

- In order to measure how buildings are satisfying the requirements of the Energy Goal, energy modeling is done during design, building meters are installed during construction, and actual performance data is tracked after construction is complete.
- Building data is not currently published, but it could be in the future. CPFM tracks the metered data (sometimes daily), and looks for correlations between the changes in the data trends and uses/occupancy/programming of the building.
- Deferred maintenance funds are carefully allocated according to a list of priority projects. These funds are used to do renovations (such as Straub Hall and Fenton Hall) which include major energy retrofits of existing buildings.

Action: No action was requested. The committees comments will be considered as the amendment proceeds.

2. Collier House Relocation Feasibility Study - Update

Background: Staff gave some background information about the Collier House. She pointed out that campus has expanded around the Collier House, so that it now stands at the campus heart. As a result of this, questions have been raised many times over the last 15 years and a number of times recently about considering a more intensive academic use at the Collier House site. Given that the house is of primary historic significance and the building and site are a City Landmark, this study is being done pro-actively so that major questions can be thoroughly addressed:

- Is it physically feasible to move the house and preserve its integrity after the move?
- Is it financially feasible to move the house?

For the purposes of this initial study, three general locations within campus boundary were considered as potential relocation sites: one was within the campus core, one a little further out and the last on the peripheries of campus. The draft of the report showed it is physically feasible to relocate the house to each one of the potential sites studied, although for locations on the campus peripheries some additional work would be necessary to move the house through the narrower streets.

If the question about relocating the Collier House became a real consideration the CPC would be involved:

- During the site selection for the project displacing the Collier House
- During the site selection study for the Collier House relocation
- During any required amendments to the Campus Plan

Discussion: The following is a compilation of questions and comments from the committee members and guests:

- This is an important question to study in order to understand if a more intense use could be considered for that site.
- The Framework Vision Project studied how important that part of campus is not only for academic use but also for outdoor public use.
- If the Collier House were relocated to make space for a new academic use, consider recreating the historical botanical feel of that site (similar to Mrs Collier's original design).
- Study how the existing site is used and what value it adds to campus.

In response to questions from committee members or guests, the project team provided the following clarifications:

- While this study does not explicitly state whether sites outside the campus boundary would be considered as potential relocation sites, it is unlikely that the Collier House would be moved beyond the campus boundary.
- The Campus Heritage Landscape Plan identified the significant trees and landscape elements (many of which were planted by Mrs Collier). There are four remaining trees from that period. The health of those trees should be assessed.
- Designing around trees can contribute positively to a new building. This has been done with some success on campus. For example, the Lewis Integrative Science Building was designed as a pair of offset bars to preserve the two oak trees to the east of the building and a raised sidewalk was designed over their critical root zones.

Action: No action was requested,

Please contact this office if you have questions.